

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, and 16 have been amended. New claim 20 has been added. Claims 1-20 are pending. On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 9, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In response to the Rejection, Applicants have amended the claims. Withdrawal of the Rejection is respectfully requested.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-6, 8, and 16-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,828,839 (Moncreiff).

Moncreiff is directed to a computer network chat room system that includes plural chat rooms. According to Moncreiff, conversation in each chat room is related to a program being broadcast in real-time over a channel in a user-defined time zone. Computer users access the chat rooms via the Internet by providing a desired television or radio channel, along with a request to enter a chat room.

In the present invention, conditions such as a message exceeding a given number of lines can be correlated with processing for the condition, for example, preparing a webpage on which the message appears and transmitting the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) of the webpage on which the message appears over a network channel. The conditions relate to the transmission object, for example, a message. Thus, a message having more than the given number of lines will not occupy the display screen for the chat. Because the message length is displayed on the webpage, it is easier for the user to read previous or next messages and to understand the entire conversation. See Specification, page 5, line 21 – page 6, line 10.

The above-identified functionality of the present invention is recited in claim 1, for example, as “correlating conditions relating to a transmission object to be transmitted over said same channel with processings for said transmission object” and “conducting at least one of said processings on said transmission object . . . , and sending said processed transmission object . . . to said channel.”

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 of the present invention is patentable over Moncreiff, as Moncreiff does not teach each and every element of claim 1, for example.

The Examiner has indicated that some of the operations of the present invention (for example, the correlation operation identified above by the quoted language) are inherent in

Moncreiff. To establish inherency, the Examiner must provide factual support and/or technical reasoning to support a determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic *necessarily* comes from teachings of a reference. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not provided any such support.

In the current Office Action, the Examiner has failed to meet this requirement, as the Examiner has simply indicated that correlation of conditions relating to a transmission object with processings is inherent in Moncreiff.

Unlike the present invention, Moncreiff correlates a channel guide with a username. See Moncreiff, column 5, lines 31-34. Thus, in contrast to the present invention, Moncreiff simply correlates one item, that is, a channel guide, with another item, that is, a user name, as opposed to correlating conditions relating to a transmission object with processings for the transmission object, as in the present invention.

A channel guide is not a condition that relates to a transmission object. Moreover, Moncreiff does not disclose processings that are correlated with conditions. Moncreiff does not necessarily have to operate by correlating conditions relating to a transmission object with processings for the object. Assuming *arguendo* that a username is a transmission object, Moncreiff does not indicate that any conditions are related to the username. Further, Moncreiff could operate by simply allowing a user to enter a username that is any length.

In other words, Moncreiff may operate by not correlating conditions with a username. Therefore, correlating conditions relating to a transmission object with processings for the object is not inherent in Moncreiff, as Moncreiff could possibly operate without conditions relating to a transmission object. In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is patentable over Moncreiff, as Moncreiff does not teach each and every element of the claim.

As claims 2, 16, and 19 recite language similar to that of claim 1, claims 2, 16, and 19 are also patentable over the reference, for at least the reason presented above with respect to claim 1. As claims 3-6 and 8 depend from independent claim 2, and claim 17 depends from independent claim 1, the dependent claims are patentable over the reference for at least the reason presented above with respect to their independent claims. As claim 18 depends from claim 16, claim 18 is patentable over the reference for at least the reason presented for claim 16.

Claims 7 and 9-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moncreiff. Moncreiff does not teach or suggest the correlation operation described above, as Moncreiff is silent on conditions relating to a transmission object and is also silent on

processings for a transmission object. As claims 7 and 9-15 depend from claim 2, these claims are patentable over the reference for at least the reason offered above, with respect to claim 1 (claim 2 recites language similar to that of claim 1, in relevant part).

New claim 20 has been added and recites language similar to that of the other independent claims. Therefore, claim 20 is patentable over the references for at least the reasons presented for the other independent claims.

It is submitted that the pending claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §102. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught by the cited references. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

Serial No. 09/883,996

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this communication, the USPTO is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Aug. 29, 2005

By: 

Reginald D. Lucas
Registration No. 46,883

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501